

3834
ELIHU'S REPLY:

OCCASIONED BY THE
AFFECTIONATE ADDRESS

OF,
MR. W. MASON,

ON BIBLE POLITICS.

BY **J. T. Owers**

— K —
“FOR YE HAVE NOT SPOKEN OF ME THE
THING THAT IS RIGHT.”

JEHOVAH.

L O N D O N:

Printed for the **AUTHOR:**

And Sold by **M. LEWIS, No. 1. PATER-NOSTER ROW.**

M.DCC.LXXV.

[**Price Two Pence.**]

ELIHUS REPLY:

OCCASIONED BY THE

AFFECTIONATE ADDRESS

OF

M. W. MASON

ON THE POLITICS



T. T.

"FOR WE HAVE NOT SPOKEN OF ME THE
THING THAT IS RIGHT"

REHOVAH

L O N D O N :

Printed for the AUTHOR :

And Sold by M. Lawe, No. 1. Faver-nest-street.

MDCCLXXV.

[Price Two Pence]

ELIHU'S REPLY

TO

MR. MASON.

SIR,

I WAS not a little sorry, on reading your *Affectionate Address*, to find so pious a character as Mr. Mason is acknowledged to be, employing his pen, to interfere either directly or indirectly in the present alarming crisis: but it convinced me, that though *days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom*; that *great men are not always wise, neither do the aged understand judgment*: it made me therefore conclude, to answer also my part; for *I am full of matter; the spirit within me constraineth me*. I was, Sir, more especially concerned, as Mr. Wesley's first and second edition of his *Calm Address* have

— already sufficiently sown the seeds of animosity against our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, and an inordinate thirst for their blood, is more than sufficiently manifested ; so that an Affectionate Address was by no means necessary as a supplement to the very contemptible and *wretchedly Calm* one.

I mean not, Sir, by these hints, to compare Mr. Mason and Mr. Wesley together. I respect the former, as one that *really* fears God, whom I hope to meet in heaven, and to join with in singing, “ Worthy is the Lamb.” The latter, I wish, I *heartily* wish to find such mercy as to come there. But while he continues to be the Windmill-Hill Jesuit, while with an implacable bitterness he maligns the precious truths of a precious Christ, and especially when his vile and antichristian principles] bring forth such bad fruit, both in divinity and politics, I shall entertain but little hopes of him, before he brings forth fruits meet for repentance.

F You have, Sir, however, by entering the political lists at this time, under such colours, the appearance of fighting in the same cause, as the arch Arminian John Wesley, though I am well persuaded, with far more upright motives than in general that gentleman’s breast ever entertains.

I cannot think, however, that your political performance (because it contains such politics as are contrary to *Bible politics*) will produce that good to the church of God, which your preceding publications, were undoubtedly calculated to promote. You should consider, Sir, there are many, very many in America, that fear God; the good seed sown there by a great minister now in heaven, has still some precious fruit left; you should therefore be cautious, while you are in a most *affectionate* manner shielding the Lord's anointed *here*, lest you touch too roughly the apple of God's eye *there*. They appear to be (what you wish us, to be) a praying people; and though your Address does not immediately speak of them, yet your Tory principles (which I believe are not at all taught you by the Bible) have insensibly led you (tho' not *totidem verbis*) but tacitly, to condemn them; otherwise, why Mr. Mason's definition of passive obedience and non-resistance, together with an attempt to prove that a doctrine so vile and justly exploded as that, is founded on scripture. Romish priests may persuade their ignorant votaries, that the Latin Vulgate contains such doctrine; but Mr. Mason will excuse me, if I plead ignorance of any such scripture being found, in any Bible I have seen; that will prove such accursed principles. Methinks, Sir, you will scarcely chuse to stand forth to defend all

that a *Jure Divino* will allow kings to do. Will Mr. Mason, to defend the *divine right* of kings, read his Bible with a pair of Tory spectacles, and, by the deception of Jacobitish glasses, justify the wicked, and condemn the righteous? I hope, I believe better things of you, Sir, than to imagine you will do this wilfully; but it is truly lamentable that there are few (even of good men) who can avoid interpreting *particular* scriptures (tho' not knowingly) to suit their own private opinions.

I heartily join with you in desiring to honour the king, and wish to have his honour promoted. I value him also for all those amiable qualities I have seen in him; but I chuse not from thence, to justify the partiality, injustice, and corruption of all in power. I was grieved when a sodomitical Jones, and the murdering Kennedys obtained the royal clemency; and I think those who with humility and respect, hint these things to his Majesty, as crying sins, which, when winked at, make the land groan; such I imagine are rendering that honour to the king which is due from every true christian: infinitely more than those who cry Peace, peace, when there is no peace. I by no means compare the King's most excellent Majesty to an Ahab, an Uzziah, nor, with Mr. Mason, to Nero; but I remember the faithful manner in which

which Elijah honoured his king, by telling Ahab, "It is thou and thy father's house which have troubled Israel *." I recollect also, that Azariah the priest shewed the same honour in telling the king, that he had trespassed: and this, I have read, Dr. Latimer thought was the right way to honour the king, when he told the first defender of the Romish faith, "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge;" and in the same faithful manner pointed out to the pious King Edward the Sixth the errors in his government, in the most plain and full terms. And this is certainly a very essential part of that duty which we owe to our king as a christian, especially because by that profession he becomes our brother, though exalted over us as sovereign; and it is the command of God's law, which binds both king and subjects, "Thou shalt in any-wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him;" and this I suppose Mr. Mason will allow to hold good to his Majesty, because in his Affectionate Address he has enforced his sage counsel with observations on that love which is due to our neighbour.

Can we then, Sir, fulfil our duty to our royal neighbour and Sovereign, if we find that

* Vide 1-Kings xvii. 18.

his servants (though they should profess the holiness of a D——th) establish popery in a considerable part of his Majesty's dominions, or that such measures are taken as will, I fear, dismember the empire, and rob his Majesty of a very valuable part of his dominions; shall we, by a culpable silence, justify those measures? Or shall we, with the infectious breath of sycophants and flatterers, attempt to poison our king with fulsome and untrue addresses; and tell him (with a lye in our right hand) that such measures are worthy himself, and calculated to promote the welfare of these realms? Is this in a godly manner to fear God, or honour the king? Shall we huzza our Sovereign (like some apprentices, whose master told me they were hired for that purpose on those days when his Majesty goes to his house of parliament) with a view to deceive him, and make him think that the conduct of his ministers is universally acceptable, and that all they do prospers? From such honour, and honouring of the king, "good Lord, deliver both him and us!"

I can truly say, Sir, that I should rejoice, in the most cordial manner, in his Majesty's temporal, spiritual, and eternal prosperity. This is my constant prayer. I think also I know something of that power in prayer (you speak of) to charm away animosity against the person
 prayed

prayed for. But I have always thought that the spirit of the people of England is similar to that of Rehoboam's subjects, and I need not tell Mr. Mason the salutary counsel that was given to him, nor the fatal consequences of his despotic refusal of it. I shall not apply it to our present situation ; it has had its application already ; and it must grievously affect every real friend to his king and country, that our case is so strikingly parallel with that of Judah, in the lamentable instance referred to, when so dreadful a division of the tribes of Israel was one of the blessed consequences of arbitrary measures.

However complete, Sir, you may imagine your system of politics to be, it so little suits the genius of the British nation, and it is so unconstitutional, that it has more than once proved fatal to kings of England, who either from choice or bad counsel have been led to act agreeable to your plan : and will Mr. Mason attempt to prove that all resistance to arbitrary government is illegal or improper ? This would be a libel on the glorious Revolution, a stab in the dark to the honour of our great deliverer King WILLIAM, a reflection on the illustrious house of Hanover, and such a concession in favour of the Pretender, as would tacitly imply, that our present lawful Sovereign GEORGE the Third* (whom God preserve !) is a

usurper. For resisting the power of James the Second, and that with arms, was the instrument which divine Providence made use of to bring in the present family; and it is certain, that whoever condemns *all* such resistance, in effect proves that James II. was unjustly banished from the Rule of these kingdoms. This be far from Mr. Mason!

And we shall find, Sir, in scripture, certain instances of those that feared God as much as Mr. Mason, who notwithstanding were not always absolutely passive under the exercise of oppressive authority.

Our blessed Lord himself, though he paid tribute, rather than offend them, yet when illegally interrogated by the high-priest, answered, "Why askest thou me?" And when the officer unjustly struck him, he with words resisted the power, and said, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of that evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" And thus the great apostle of the Gentiles resisted the despotism and illegality of the power that was deputed by the higher powers, when the magistrates sent to let them go; Paul then said, "They have beaten us openly and uncondemned being Romans, and have cast us into prison, and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily, but let them come them-

themselves and fetch us out." And this I suppose he did and said without wounding his conscience or receiving damnation to himself. If Mr. Mason, and a *respectable* friend of his, had been in that case, no doubt but they would have fallen on their knees, and in an humble Address thanked them for their lenity, and perhaps have told them, if they thought proper, they might even murder them, not merely for their religion, but to shew their submission to the higher powers. But Paul was not only a great christian, but a noble Roman citizen, and was convinced of the propriety of contending for lawful liberty.

I shall trouble you, Sir, with one instance more of a similar nature; and that is from the Old Testament, concerning a stubborn, rebellious fellow of the name of Naboth, who when the king came in a most gracious manner, and said to him, "Give me thy vineyard, that I may have it for a garden of herbs, because it is near unto my house, and I will give thee for it a better vineyard than it; or if it seem good to thee, I will give thee the worth of it in money. Then Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers to thee." And Ahab told Jezebel his wife that Naboth had said, "I will not give thee my vineyard." But Jezebel said,
Dost

Dost thou now govern the kingdom of [Israel?]" This royal woman conceived that kings had a *divine* right to dispose of their subjects property at their pleasure, and that they could do no wrong. "And therefore she wrote letters in the king's name to proclaim a fast, and set Naboth on high, and commanded that they should accuse him of blaspheming God and the king." And they were such passive subjects, that though they knew Naboth was innocent, rather than resist the power, they honoured the king by executing his Jezebel's commands; the consequence of which was, that Naboth was stoned, and Ahab obtained his vineyard. But by the just judgment of God, in the same place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, they were feasted with the royal blood of the king*. If Mr. Mason should compare the *rebellious* Americans to Naboth, whether I think it a parallel case with *theirs*, or not, I promise him I shall never differ with him on that head; but only wish to prove, that it is undoubtedly the privilege of Britons to *appeal to and be governed by* the laws of this country, which in their very nature are free.

I could sanguinely wish, Sir, before you condemn all opposition to despotism as unchristianly, that you would study the nature of the English constitution a little more; but I would not advise you to think of reading your knowledge

* Vide 1 Kings, chap. xxi.

ledge in that particular, from Mr. Wesley's intended publication of the History of England; for should that gentleman pirate those authors he intends to write from, in the same unfair manner he did the judicious Mr. Toplady's work, your labour will then be lost. However, Sir, you will do well to remember on what plan the present honourable family were raised to the crown of these realms; they were not, my good Sir, originally heirs to it; they were exalted, though in a way of providence, to that majesty by the majesty of the people; and our present gracious Sovereign has (if I mistake not) [most solemnly sworn to defend those rights of the people which the abjured race of the Stuarts endeavoured to deprive us of; in attempting which, they met with the due reward of their deeds.

And shall we entertain so unfavourable an opinion of his Majesty, as to think he has no regard to his oath? or that he is void of that desire (which dwells in every real christian) to have his pure heart stirred up by way of remembrance, when there appears to be danger of an Ahitophel's counsel causing him to seem to turn either to the right hand or to the left? Surely no. And certainly, in respect to our duty to God, it is possible to lay an humble claim to that, which, as Britons, is our birthright, without

out offending *Him*, or resisting *his* ordinance by whose free grace all true christians are heirs of a better country.

I intirely agree with you, Sir, that every king, however wicked, and that even Nero as emperor, was to be honoured, and I believe every christian will grant you that concession; I imagine therefore you have put no small affront on the understanding of your Whig readers, in supposing they should be weak enough to argue like your *self-denying deep-sighted politicians*. Such arguments would betray either the total want of the fear of God, or the grossest ignorance. But it should seem that Mr. Mason supposes none are truly wise, but those who think as he does in politics;—and no doubt but ye Tories are the men, and wisdom shall die with you;—but we have *some* understanding as well as you: and tho' we would tremble at the word of God, and bow to his divine command, even to honour a Nero, yet, unless political dust should blind our eyes, justice must convince us, that though no consideration can take away the necessity of honouring the king, yet there is a very essential difference between the connection of Nero and his christian subjects, and the connection of GEORGE the Third and Britons: Nero was under no engagement with the christians as christians; but it is diametrically otherwise in this nation.

nation. The christians could expect nothing but tyranny and persecution from an heathen even on account of religion ; and it was their wisdom not only to submit as loyal subjects, but even in some cases to be injured and suffer wrong, if possible to take away his unjust prejudices against them; and there was then no law of man in being, that would in any respect shield them from acts of violence as christians. But our Sovereign professes the christian religion, professes to worship the same God, to be bound by the same sacred ties, and to be accountable to the same Lord : and as we his subjects should on this account serve him more chearfully, so likewise we may expect (it would imply a doubt of his Majesty's christianity not to expect) that he will govern us not as slaves, but free-born protestants. If we do not complain when the constitution is struck at, it would demonstrate either a culpable insensibility of the excellency of it, or that we do not imagine our king to be the father of his people; for every affectionate parent wishes to hear, that he may redress, the grievances of his children; and as he will not oppress them himself, neither will he suffer his *servants* to oppress them. I speak thus, because it has been usual for Englishmen to honour their king with the very pleasing and honourable title of the Sire and Father of his people. And such indeed is the peculiar excellency of our constitution,

tution, that it requires a paternal heart in our king, and a filial disposition in the subject ; and so unites the power of the Sovereign and the liberty of his people, that every improper exertion of the one is a trespass on the other, and a wound to the whole. And as the subject rising against the sovereign when he governs *according to law*, is justly deemed rebellion, and is an attempt to injure the constitution ; so likewise despotic measures are a similar evil, and a like attempt to injure the other part of the constitution.

I think, Sir, your definition of patriots and patriotism is truly admirable, and beyond measure extraordinary : I have heard such things from a pulpit, whence perhaps Mr. Mason caught his flame. You seem to assert, that there are no patriots but those who have the grace of God in their hearts. If you mean there is no patriotism that is well pleasing to God, without grace, I heartily concur with you ; for it is certain, that without faith it is impossible to please God, either in patriotism or any other virtue. But it is evident, that there are many who, without the love of God in their hearts, and whose conduct a captious opponent might justly censure, who notwithstanding love their country, and are instruments of much good to it, from the same principles that lead them to
love

love their friends, and live honestly among men. I know, Sir, that even honesty is not a spiritual service to God, without faith in an adorable Jesus: but will Mr. Mason assert, or, if he asserts, can he prove, that no man is honest without converting grace? None can be honest to God and their souls, but those who fear God above all; but there are many who rob God, and lose their own souls, and yet are so honest in respect to man, that it were to be wished many professors would tread more in the same steps. Had this been more generally the case, Mr. Wesley would have acknowledged his obligations to Dr. Johnson for his political conversion, and the rubbish of his *calm* publication; before the laws of dire necessity compelled him to it: and whatever Mr. Mason may think, I should think it a breach of honesty not to allow that there are some patriots in this kingdom, who do not indeed profess the piety either of a D——h or a S——h, but are worthy of much honour as men. Cannot Mr. Mason trace so much as an outline of patriotism in a Chatham, a Camden, &c.? I must omit an Effingham from the list for *rebellious* reasons. And does Mr. Mason really think that none were in the least respect worthy the name of patriots among the Romans, the Grecians, &c.? I have heard of 300 men engaging with a vast army in a narrow pass, where there was no possibility of their escaping

escaping death from their enemies, with a view to serve their country, and intimidate the great multitude of their foes, by presenting to them a striking idea of their courage. I suppose indeed that they desired the praise and glory of man. This proved that their patriotism (if this was the case) was not the fruit of a divine faith, but I conceive it by no means made them intirely void of patriotism. However, Sir, you may think it did, such a procedure was calculated to do much good to their country; and perhaps Mr. Mason is more obliged to such patriots than he imagines; and had it not been for such *false* patriots, as you account them, we might perhaps to this day have been enslaved by popery, and its near relations and common companions, despotism and tyranny. Men were the instruments, and, as such, it becomes us to render them honour, as them unto whom it is due; though the Lord being on our side was the *Primum Mobile*, and the glory is only due to him.

I have hitherto, Sir, animadverted on your political publication, in the general; I purpose now, as I would not trespass on your nor any other reader's patience, to trouble you with a few observations on your text, and other portions of scripture, which you have reflected some dishonour upon, by joining them with your beloved ideas of passive obedience and non-resistance.

resistance. I know not what might induce you
 to chuse such portions of scripture to begin
 with, as breathe the spirit of spiritual war; but
 I can assure you some persons were led to think
 that the Americans were encouraged *thereby* to
 fight; but on a perusal, Mr. Mason was in-
 tirely acquitted of any such disloyalty. But
 methinks, Sir, as you covet so much in your
 Postscript to have matters reconciled, you should
 have avoided those texts that seem to encourage
 war at this juncture. We need not wonder if
 the author of the Calm Address, with an olive-
 branch in his mouth, stirs up the people of Eng-
 land to shed the blood of their brethren; his
 trumpet has long been used to give an uncertain
 sound; he can assert, that "we are pleasing or
 displeasing to God every moment according to
 our works;" and, by a striking piece of his own
 original sophistry, forged at his own Foundery,
 metamorphose it, by sleight of heart and tongue,
 from a satanic blackness to a more than angelic
 purity, or salvation by grace. But we expect
 better things of Mr. Mason. You seem so zea-
 lous to promote the honour of the king (which
 is certainly a godly business) that you appear to
 intimate, that it is a duty, at least equal with
 that we owe to God. I readily grant you, that
 every man who fears God will (as it is his in-
 dispensable duty) honour the king; and that it
 is a part of our duty to God to obey his com-
 mand

mand, to honour and pray for the king. But our first, our chief duty is to God; and when the higher powers ordain any thing that is sinful, christians must be excused from submitting to it, though they should be cast into the lions den like Daniel, or the fiery furnace like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, as the fruit of their disobedience to an earthly king, but of their obedience to and love to the King of kings and Lord of lords; but in every *lawful* ordinance of the higher powers (and not merely what this or that man thinks lawful, but what the law of God and the whole legislative power in England have pronounced lawful) it becomes us, in this sense, as God's people, to be subject to the higher powers, not only for wrath, but (as you well observe) for the Lord's and for conscience sake. But Mr. Mason should have set some limits to his loyal directions for passive obedience; else if a christian, that had learned the first rudiments of religious politics from the *Calm*, and the more abstruse points from the *Affectionate Address*, was by any means conveyed to Canada, he might think that because popery was established by law there, it was his duty (tho' a protestant) in obedience to the higher powers, to go to mass, to worship the host, and wash away the guilt of all by the purchase of a pardon from his Holiness.

It

It appears, Sir, to occasion you much grief, that so many speak evil of dignities; and whenever that evil is manifested, it should grieve the godly mind. But as Mr. Mason has found this evil so much abound, it would have been an additional kindness to all other his political hints, if he had told us plainly what it is to speak evil of dignities, that by the help of that Vademecum we might in all companies avoid the dangerous evil. No rational creature in his senses, nor much less any christian, will speak evil of that power which is a terror to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well. Such were the powers that Paul intended, when writing to the Romans, as appears from his own words. But Mr. Mason must inform us how we should act when the power encourages evil works. Will he advise us then to call evil good; or if we chuse to be silent, will he enable us, and teach us that it is right, to *think no evil*? When the power by the Roman governor Pilate crucified Christ, the power was still to be honoured, but to justify the Act would be wicked. And I imagine, Sir, you are in a great measure beating the air, when you quote the apostles Peter and Jude to prove your principles, and to enable you the more gravely to pass sentence on your brethren. It appears to me, that when those apostles are speaking of such who despise dominion or government, it principally

pally respects those who would have no government or dominion at all, but would have all men upon a level, and that principally to indulge their own vile principles and practices with impunity. Such were the abominable tenets of a seditious priest, of the name of John Ball, in the reign of Richard II. in the year 1381, who used this theme in his sermons,

When Adam dug, and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?

with a view to confound all order, and destroy superiority and inferiority, which God has wisely ordained for the benefit of mankind in general. But I believe there are many, whom Mr. Mason levels his artillery against, who are very far from desiring this, and who desire to honour, to pray for, and submit to the king, and to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's. If any are otherwise minded, who *profess* to fear God, I cannot join with them.

On the whole, Sir, tho' I have taken upon me to reply to your Address; tho', where I thought it necessary, I have not spared you, neither have given flattering titles to men, lest my Maker should take me away; and tho', in what I have done, you may perhaps think I have taken too much upon me; yet I can truly
say,

say, that what I have written, I have written with cordial affection to you as a christian, and with honour to the king in my heart; and tho' I cannot say with that *mirror of integrity*, Mr. *John*, that "I have no advantage from that cause on the behalf of which I write, and *probably never may*," (which expression appears to have what the grammarians call the adverb of wishing joined with it; or the contempt shewed by the fox at the inaccessible grapes,) though destitute of these recommendations. I frankly own, on the contrary, that I reap much advantage, as a citizen of a free state, from revolutionary principles. And yet I contend not for *more*, but the *continuation* of revolutionary liberty; and I thus employed my pen, because, in my humble opinion, your scripture proofs are in a measure wrested, though ignorantly; and because I was moved with fear for my king and my fellow christians, lest if such arbitrary principles were adopted, such measures might be taken, as *probably may* prevent reconciliation with America, injure his Majesty's revenue, destroy our commercial interest, and mortally wound the constitution.

We perfectly agree, Sir, in the *guilty* cause of our troubles; and that to turn from our sins, and apply to the throne of grace, is our best

best remedy. I could wish also to supplicate the
 God of our mercy, in a general fast; to pray,
 with Mr. Mason, that God may save the king,
 may pardon our sins and heal our breaches, and
 cause us to walk thankfully in his fear; which
 is the desire and prayer of

7 AP 66

Your unworthy brother

in our common Lord,

J. T.

F L N I S

We perfectly agree, Sir, in the unity of
 our religion; and that to turn from our
 first, and apply to the current of grace, is our
 duty.

